

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Claim Status**

Claims 1-54 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 18, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 34-36 have been amended. Claims 1 and 23 are independent in form. Claims 7, 29, 51 and 53 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Rejections**

**35 USC §112, Second paragraph**

Claims 3, 4 and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the recitation of “the work group” in claim 3 (and consequently claim 4 dependent therefrom) and “said editing step” of claims 34-36 each lack antecedent basis.

In response to §112 rejection, the dependencies of claims 3 and 34-36 have been amended so that claim 3 now depends from claim 2 and claims 34-36 each now depend from claim 31. Claim 25, similar to claim 3 but not formally rejected, was amended to depend from claim 24 to address similar language as rejected for claim 3.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is accordingly overcome or otherwise rendered moot and respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 19, 22-26, 29, 31-36, 38, 39, 41, 44-51 and 53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Vitek et al (USP 4,845,634; "Vitek").

As will be explained in further detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 23, as amended, are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, Vitek alone or in combination with any other art of record.

The present invention, as recited in amended claim 1, is directed to a work standard creation system for creating a work standard data related to an assembly work of various goods. The claimed system includes input means, retrieving means, selecting means and storage means. Inputting means is provided for separately inputting a character of a word; retrieving means for retrieving words each having semantics of the input character and including the input character; and, selecting means for selecting a verb, an object, and an auxiliary word. Further, the selected verb, object, and auxiliary word are processed separately by the input means, retrieving means and selecting means. Storage means is provided for storing the selected verb, object and auxiliary word as a sentence indicative of work standard. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in the specification at page 25, line 2 to page 26, line 12 and Figure 11.

According to the present invention, it is possible to unify words used in an assembly work place when a work standard is created. More specifically, since, in the present invention, a verb word, an object word and an auxiliary word related thereto are separately retrieved rather than retrieving one sentence including those words, it is possible to retrieve words which can be utilized for the system and then to efficiently and quickly create a work

standard. Moreover the verb, object and auxiliary words constitute in cooperation one sentence included in the work standard.

Vitek, on the other hand, discloses that the database retrieves board style number, type code and current revision level, as recited in lines 31-2, column 10 (also 400, 402 and 406 in Fig. 29). However, unlike the present invention, board style number, type code and current revision level in Vitek each does not constitute one sentence of a work standard. Further, Vitek neither discloses nor suggests that retrieving means retrieves words each having semantics of an input character and each including the input character as claimed.

As such, Vitek does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1.

Claim 23 is directed to a method claim corresponding to claim 1.

The present invention as recited in each of independent claim 1 and 23 is thus clearly distinguishable from the cited art in at least the several respects stated above and is therefore neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Vitek, taken individually or in combination with any other art of record.

Claims 7, 29, 51 and 53 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejections as to these claims moot. As the remaining rejected claims 2-4, 9-14, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 31-36, 38, 39, 41 and 44-50 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 23 which is thus believed to be patentable over Vitek, these dependent claims are also believed patentable for at least similar reasons.

**35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 15, 18, 20, 21, 37, 40, 42 and 43 are rejected under §103 as allegedly being obvious over Vitek as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 19, 22-26, 29, 31-36, 38, 39, 41, 44-51 and 53 and in view of Nigawara et al. (USP 5,771,043; "Nigawara"). Claims 5, 6, 8,

27, 28, 30, 52 and 54 are rejected under §103 as allegedly being obvious over Vitek as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 19, 22-26, 29, 31-36, 38, 39, 41, 44-51 and 53 and in view of Motoyama. (USP 6,208,956).

Since claims 15, 18, 20, 21, 37, 40, 42 and 43 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 23, which are now believed patentably distinguishable over Vitek, these claims are also patentably distinguishable over Vitek and Vitek in view of Nigawara for at least similar reasons.

Further, since claims 5, 6, 8, 27, 28, 30 and 52-54 also depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 23, these dependent claims are also patentably distinguishable over Vitek taken individually or in combination with Motoyama for at least similar reasons as for claims 1 or 23.

**Dependent Claims**

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, the dependent claims are also believed allowable for at least similar reasons as stated for the independent claims from which they depend. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and that the respective rejections be withdrawn. Applicant further submits that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Applicants believe no fees are required for this paper and that no extension of time is required for this filing. However, should an extension of time be necessary to render this filing timely, such is hereby petitioned, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4670.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 17, 2003

By: 

Stephen J. Manetta

Registration No. 40,426

Correspondence Address:

Morgan & Finnegan, L.L.P.  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10154  
(212) 758-4800 (Telephone)  
(212) 751-6849 (Facsimile)